

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

In re:

Case No. 09-57535

GREGORY E. BENT, *pro se*, and
CHANNIE BENT, *pro se*,

Chapter 13

Judge Thomas J. Tucker

Debtors.

**ORDER DENYING DEBTORS' MOTIONS FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
SCHEDULES AND STATEMENTS (DOCKET ## 16 AND 23)
AND DISMISSING CASE**

On June 3, 2009, Debtors filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 13, initiating this case. On June 18, 2009, Debtors filed a "Motion For Extension of Time to File Schedules," seeking a 30-day extension of the June 18, 2009 deadline to file Schedules and Statements. (Docket # 16, "the Motion"). On June 22, 2009, the Clerk of the Court issued a Notice of Deficient Filing regarding the Motion because of a missing and/or non-compliant: (1) Notice to Respondent; (2) Proof of Service; and (3) Proposed Order. The Notice provided: "A corrected/missing document is required within (8) eight days of this notice. If not corrected, the case may be dismissed or an order striking the document from the record may be entered by the Court. The new document filed should be identified as '**CORRECTED.**'" (Docket # 21.)

On June 30, 2009, Debtors filed what the Court construes as another motion for extension of time to file schedules and statements, a purported notice of that motion and a purported proposed order (Docket # 23) and a Certificate of Service (Docket # 24), in an apparent attempt to correct the problems noted in the Notice of Deficient Filing. These documents do not correct

the deficiencies in the Notice of Deficient Filing.¹

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Debtors' motions for extension of time to file schedules and statements (Docket ## 16 and 23) are DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED, without prejudice to Debtors filing a new bankruptcy case when they are able to file all of the required documents.

Signed on July 11, 2009

/s/ Thomas J. Tucker
Thomas J. Tucker
United States Bankruptcy Judge

¹ The Notice is not a 15-day notice on an official form, the order does not state the specific relief that would be granted, and is more properly construed as a motion rather than an order, and the certificate of Service does not relate to the Motion.